

*Who Started the Term, "Dirty Tricks," Anyway?***"GOOD TRICKS"—OR "CIA MAGIC"**

The Central Intelligence Agency, psychologically, by order or by infiltration, seems to have lost or abandoned a sense of indignation, and defense, although how it can forego self-defense without it including national defense as well is a question. The relationship between the two is illustrated by the virtual monopoly that has apparently been allowed to KGB operations, especially in the covert arena. Isn't this what we are witnessing in places as far apart as Portugal and Panama, in India and yes, in Washington, D. C. ?

The dominoes are falling, just as warned, except that they are not falling in line, as expected.

What should have been obvious from the start was that a nation cannot adopt a no-win policy in one area of its thinking without it gradually dominating thought in all areas. This is what we are experiencing.

General Edwin A. Walker sensed this in Korea, calling it givupitis. His efforts to combat it when put in command in Europe led to his being squeezed out of the service. He wouldn't tolerate a no-win outlook.

Obviously, this defeatist state of mind is official policy, along with acceptance of what, in effect, is a double standard in our dealings with our friends and our enemies. All down history—actually since man's beginnings—preference has been given to friends.

The preference, under the double standard as we now observe it, is being accorded to our enemies.

This is how it works out—the real "dirty tricks."

CIA, AND TERM "DIRTY TRICKS"

These indignant paragraphs are provoked by what might seem to many as an unimportant detail. But the reactions and attitudes that determine success or failure are based upon such details, as the following:

Whenever reference is made to the covert arm of our national defense, entrusted to the CIA, we read or hear it referred to as "dirty tricks," or the "dirty tricks department" of the CIA.

One might argue and with some justification that the CIA, as with the FBI, can be unjustly but safely accused of practically anything, without they being in a position to respond.

They can't take the chance of replying without giving important information or intelligence to an enemy that uses this tactic to smoke out revealing data.

But this pertains primarily to specific operations. Certainly, where the honor and the character of the agency are brought into question as a generality, the response should be prompt and unequivocal.

The morale of its own staff is at stake, not only the manner in which our people and foreign countries regard the organization. The difference between a favorable or unfavorable image is often the decisive factor in accomplishment or frustration.

No reason exists, except a cowed state of mind, for the CIA to accept the term, "dirty tricks," as the correct description of its covert operations section.

A far more accurate, truer label for the work done

would be "clean tricks," if some synonym were really needed for the fine, descriptive word, "covert," or "clandestine." The original, colloquial term used was "black," as distinguished from "white," that means aboveboard, or overt—its true source "open" to all.

The term, "black," had to be discarded when the colored or Negro race began to be referred to almost exclusively as "black," no matter how white-skinned many were. There were propaganda—"psywar"—considerations in this semantic switch, of course, but it forced a change in covert terminology, so a psychological warfare term would not be confused with race.

"Black," in its racial sense, was accompanied by the slogan, "black is beautiful," but the same word in the area of psychological warfare, or "psywar," became "dirty tricks." Why?

Who decided that covert meant "dirty tricks," anyway? This was a "psywar" operation itself, and not on "our side." Did the false label originate in the press, or with the same so-called "dissenters" who gave us "pigs" for police? Both suggest similar motivation.

EDITOR'S SPECIAL INTEREST IN IT

So-called "image," all too often artificially produced, becomes the basis for favor or disfavor in the United States, and in varied, calculated ways, elsewhere, as well. "Radical chic" is based on it, to the advantage of the far left.

The pejorative term, "dirty tricks," made the job of the "radical chic" easier. The CIA certainly should have counteracted this. The impact on the American mind would have been felicitous. Instead, by silence that seemed to be acquiescence, a state of mind was encouraged that was receptive to the unfair and wild accusations against the C.I.A.

These were the real "dirty tricks," undercutting the working morale and effectiveness of the CIA, and inviting crippling and paralyzing restrictions.

The FBI, to a degree, has been similarly hurt.

This subject is of particular personal interest to this editor, because from the OSS (Office of Strategic Services) to the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), he was involved in covert operations. The word, tricks, is a belittling appellation, for they were beneficial in the areas of his influence, good and clean, not dirty.

Wartime use aroused the desire for freedom, that lies latent among the most suppressed, even in those who do not comprehend it, and taught them how, with comparative safety, they could express this in deeds.

If one wants a colloquial label for covert, maybe the truest would be, CIA magic, if not "good tricks."